

25X1A9a

Comments on Mr. [REDACTED] Paper

1. It is true that the first decade is most difficult to characterize. It certainly was not a decade of "indifference" or "neglect," at least so far as the US Government was concerned, nor among some sectors of the population, although probably so from the point of view of large sectors of public opinion. For instance this was the period of the famed Hoover mission to Russia which provided immediate and effective aid to the Soviet people in food, clothing and other necessities. Twenty years later the Hoover mission was the model for UNRRA and ultimately for the immediate-relief aspects of the Marshall Plan. This was also the decade in which some basic and highly important technical assistance was rendered the Soviet Union through private sources, in the form of engineers who went to Russia to help build factories, power stations, etc. During the 20's, too, several young Russians were sent to higher institutions of learning in the US (Among these were such people as Lurya, now regarded as the Soviet Union's top psychologist, and the head of Soviet Metallurgical industries). Ironically, it would seem now, the Soviet Union was the first large power in the world to get "Point IV" type aid from us although of course that term was not born until the late 1940's. Politically this was the period when we were alternately phobic and contemptuous of the "bearded Bolsheviks." To this extent it is right to say we were "confused" about what was really transpiring in the USSR.

2. The 1930's saw the formal recognition by us of the USSR, the arrival of Litvinov, etc., and high hopes among some "liberals" that a new day had dawned in US-Soviet relations. This was mingled with apprehension on the part of others that we were being bamboozled by the Communists. It was also probably - but not nearly to the extent viewed with alarm by anti-New Dealers - when the CPUSA achieved its greatest penetration of American labor unions, unemployed demonstrations, etc. Above all, it was the decade which terminated with the shocking disillusionment (for some) resulting from the turnabout of the Nazi-Soviet pact. This jarred leftists and rightists alike and perhaps

brought about the first really hard look at the amoral nature of totalitarianism. ("A plague on both your blouses," as MP A.P. Herbert said in the British parliament).

3. 1940's - nothing to add except to emphasize the irremediable tragedy involved in our concessions to the Soviets in permitting their troops to occupy and control unilaterally such countries as Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland.

4. The 1950's - era "awakening," yes, but essentially limited to the military sphere. Too little awareness of the non-military strategy and tactics of the Soviets (sputniks, the progress of the sciences generally, Soviet economic gains, etc.) and virtually no consciousness of the colossus "aborning" of Communist China, including what turned out to be its almost-decisive role in Korea and later in Vietnam.

5. The 1960's: This should be the decade when we will come to recognize the true strengths and weaknesses of the Soviet Bloc. This will be the decade when, if the nuclear stalemate (the "tacit US-Soviet non-aggression pact") is maintained, the great issues and major struggle will lie with the many-faceted non-physical areas of conflict ("the conflict of systems"), when the Soviet Union using the mobilized and integrated means of science and technology will be taking great strides in transforming its society into a Communist "model" for the rest of the world - particularly the underdeveloped areas - to emulate, while at the same time it will try to intensify its external propaganda and subversive efforts and some of the subtler forms of global economic warfare. This will be the decade when we will have to undertake unremitting self-examination as the basis for re-evaluating our goals nationally and globally and re-shaping our total strategy to meet the intensified challenge of the non-military but decisive "conflict of systems."

25X1A9a